

REMARKS

Information Disclosure Statements (IDSs)

IDSs were filed on July 25, 2005; October 2, 2006; and September 10, 2007. It is respectfully requested that initialed Forms 1449 be provided for these IDSs.

Drawing Objection

The drawings were objected to as the description of new FIG. 3 was allegedly missing from the specification. However, the specification was amended by the amendment of December 20, 2004 to include a description of FIG. 3. As such, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

Claims 2-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,260,834 (Carlson) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0068631 (Raverdy et al.)

Specification Amendment

The specification is amended to correct errors of a clerical or grammatical nature. No new matter is added.

Claim Amendments

The claims are amended to patentably distinguish over the cited references.

The Cited References

Carlson is directed to a gaming system 100 including a gaming server 110 that is connected to a plurality of gaming machines 120-124 via a network bus 130. (Col. 4, lines 5-8). A gaming machine encrypts information using a key 160 and transmits the encrypted information over the network bus 130. The encrypted information is transmitted to the gaming server 110 or to another one of the gaming machines. (Col. 6, lines 12-20).

Raverdy et al. is directed to an electronic system including one or more user devices 114 and an event server 138. (¶0031). The user devices 114 may be portable wireless telecommunication devices. (¶0032). In one embodiment, one or more winners may be

identified, and award certificates created and encrypted. The award certificates are transmitted to the appropriate user devices 114. (¶0082). An award certificate may include owner information, certificate usage history, certificate transfer history, certificate description, security information, and data. (¶0083).

Applicants' Claimed Invention Would Not Have Been Obvious

Three criteria must be met to establish obviousness. First, the prior art must provide one of ordinary skill in the art with a suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the teachings of the references relied upon in rejecting the claims. Second, the prior art must provide one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art, either alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the rejected claims. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention, as well as the reasonable expectation of success, must come from the prior art and not from Applicants' disclosure. If any one of these criteria is not met, a case of obviousness is not established. Also, some articulated reasoning with rational underpinnings must be provided to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-23 would not have been obvious in view of Carlson and Raverdy et al.

Amended claim 2, for example, is directed to a method for providing an award on a network of gaming machines. The method comprises encrypting a server initiated message on the network at a server with a key pair that is generated using a setup key stored both in memory associated with the server and in memory associated with a gaming machine wherein the setup key is removed from the memory associated with the gaming machine after generation of the key pair. The message is transmitted to one of the gaming machines to establish communication with the gaming machine. The message is decrypted at the gaming machine and an award is paid at the gaming machine in response to the message.

The combination Carlson and Raverdy et al. neither discloses nor suggests a setup key as set out in the amended claims. As such, Applicants' claimed invention would not have been obvious in view of these references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date is requested.

If prosecution of this application can be assisted by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at (510) 663-1100.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this amendment (including any fees due for an extension of time), such fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. IGT1P306C1).

Dated: April 22, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/William J. Egan, III/

William J. Egan, III
Reg. No. 28,411

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250